



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/422,347 | 10/21/1999 | DIRK OOMS | Q056325 | 5427 | |
| 7590 07/22/2004 SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | LEVITAN, DMITRY | | |
| | ON, DC 200373202 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | , | | 2662 | 22 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advison, Actic | | 09/422,347 | OOMS ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Dmitry Levitan | 2662 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this | communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence addre | 9SS | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| | PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| event, however, will the statutory pe ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN 706.07(f). | the mailing date of this Advertiod for reply expire later the THE FIRST REPLY WAS | visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the lan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Se | ee MPEP | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under have been filed is the date for purposes of dete 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expital (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 | ermining the period of exten ration date of the shortened e Office later than three mo | sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in | e fee. The appropriate exte the final Office action; or (2 | ension fee under 2) as set forth in | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| $2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) | will not be entered b | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcor | ne the following rejec | ction(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended canceling the non-allowable | | d be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely filed | amendment | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhill application in condition for a | | | sidered but does NO | T place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will No raised by the Examiner in the | | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which wer | e newly | | | |
| | | t(s) a)□ will not be entered or t ould be rejected is provided be | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (| or will be) as follows | : | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: 1-16. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from cor | sideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed of | on is a) | proved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information | n Disclosure Stateme | ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | | 611550 | HASSAN KIZOU | | | | |
| | | | visory patènt exam Hnology center 260 | | | | |

1. Applicant's arguments filed 06/08/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner believes that Boivie teaches compressing final destination addresses, because nodes R1 or R2 are not destinations of the system but essential parts of the destination addresses of B, C or D nodes.